REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 9, 11 and 13 were objected because of specific informalities in the text of the claims. By this Amendment, each of the specific errors has been corrected. For this reason, it is requested that this ground of objection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§102(b) as being anticipated by Speit et al.(Speit)

Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 9 has been amended to point out that the claimed optical glass "consists essentially of" the recited components and to point out that the Al_2O_3 content is "0-0.4%" as disclosed in Example 3 of the specification.

The glass of Speit contains 0.1-5% of CeO_2 as an essential ingredient for preventing absorption of X-ray and absorption in the visible ray region. In contrast, the glass of the present invention does not contain CeO_2. Since the present invention differs from Speit in that the glass disclosed by Speit is a high absorbance lead oxide containing glass intended for use as a cathode ray tube picture screen. The refractive index due to the compaction phenomenon in the present invention is quite small and is not suggested by the Speit patent. For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§102(b) as being anticipated by Inamura et al. (Inamura).

Inamura discloses a glass that has Al_2O_3 as an essential component at a level of 0.5% to 9%. The amended claims point out that the maximum amount of Al_2O_3 is 0-0.4% which distinguishes the claimed glass from the glass disclosed by Inamura. The comparative examples of Inamura (Example 10 and 11) disclose a glass having a Na_2O content of 4% while the claims of the present application point out that 5-14% of Na_2O is present. For this reason, the glass composition disclosed by Inamura is distinguishable form the claimed glass of the present invention.

The different composition of the Inamura glasses gives those glasses different properties. The characteristic feature that varies is the refractive index which is due to the compaction of the claimed compositions which is not disclosed or suggested by Inamura. For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection not be applied to the amended claims.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§102(b) as being anticipated by Dalton et al. (Dalton).

Reconsideration is requested.

The Dalton patent teaches the addition of Rb_2O as an additive that increases the electrical resistance of the glass. The amount of Rb2O that is used is equivalent to 1/20 of the total amount of the alkali metal oxides which are employed at a level of 5-20%. The claims of the present application point out a composition that does not include Rb_2O. For these reasons, the claimed glasses are distinctly different from the glasses disclosed by Dalton.

The amount of Na_2O in Comparative Examples 15 and 18 of Table 1 of Dalton is 1.2% whereas the amount of Na_2O in the claimed glasses of the present invention is 5-14%. The composition disclosed by Dalton does not anticipate or make obvious the glasses defined by the amended claims of the present invention. For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§102(b) as being anticipated by Davis et al. (Davis)

Reconsideration is requested.

The glasses disclosed by Davis utilize PbO and ZnO, as an essential ingredient to increase the refractive index. The glasses defined by the amended claims of the present invention do not contain ZnO. For this reason, the glasses disclosed by Davis fail to anticipate the amended claims of the present application and it is requested that this ground of rejection not be applied to reject the amended claims of the present application.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

James V. Costigan
Reg. No. 25,669

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 302-8989

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 10/12/04